



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

SERIAL NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY OR AGENT NO.
---------------	-------------	----------------------	-----------------------

EXAMINER	ART UNIT	DATE RECEIVED
----------	----------	---------------

DATE MAILED

12-15-93

This is a communication from the examiner in charge of your application
COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

☒ This application has been examined ☐ Responsive to communication filed on _____ ☐ This action is made final.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), _____ days from the date of this letter.
Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. 35 U.S.C. 133

Part I THE FOLLOWING ATTACHMENT(S) ARE PART OF THIS ACTION:

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited by Examiner, PTO-892. | 2. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsman's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948. |
| 3. <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Art Cited by Applicant, PTO-1449. | 4. <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152. |
| 5. <input type="checkbox"/> Information on How to Effect Drawing Changes, PTO-1474. | 6. <input type="checkbox"/> _____ |

Part II SUMMARY OF ACTION

1. ☒ Claims 1-14 & 15-20 are pending in the application.
Of the above, claims _____ are withdrawn from consideration.
2. ☐ Claims _____ have been cancelled.
3. ☐ Claims _____ are allowed.
4. ☒ Claims 1-14 & 15-20 are rejected.
5. ☐ Claims _____ are objected to.
6. ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.
7. ☐ This application has been filed with informal drawings under 37 C.F.R. 1.85 which are acceptable for examination purposes.
8. ☐ Formal drawings are required in response to this Office action.
9. ☐ The corrected or substitute drawings have been received on _____. Under 37 C.F.R. 1.84 these drawings are ☐ acceptable; ☐ not acceptable (see explanation or Notice of Draftsman's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948).
10. ☐ The proposed additional or substitute sheet(s) of drawings, filed on _____, has (have) been ☐ approved by the examiner; ☐ disapproved by the examiner (see explanation).
11. ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed _____, has been ☐ approved; ☐ disapproved (see explanation).
12. ☒ Acknowledgement is made of the claim for priority under 35 U.S.C. 119. The certified copy has ☐ been received ☒ not been received
☐ been filed in parent application, serial no. _____; filed on _____.
13. ☐ Since this application appears to be in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.
14. ☐ Other

EXAMINER'S ACTION

Art Unit 3404

Claims 1-14 and 16-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. It is not understood whether the applicant is claiming a process or apparatus. If a process is being claimed then each and every method step should be presented in a logical and sequential manner which will describe a complete process capable of accomplishing the disclosed function. If the applicant's invention is drawn to an apparatus it is incumbent on the applicant to set forth each and every structural element of his invention as well as the necessary structural communication positioned above these recited elements. This complete apparatus should be capable of functioning as disclosed.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103 which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:


A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Subject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under subsection (f) or (g) of section 102 of this title, shall not preclude patentability under this section where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person.

Claims 1-14 and 16-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Hnilcka, Jr. in view of Russian Patent 1,157,711 (hereinafter referred to as "SU"). Hnilcka, Jr. shows the overall combination of cryogenic liquid storage facility including inner tank 10, outer tank 13, superinsulation 15, absorbent material 20, and associated plumbing for pulling a vacuum, etc. Absent therefrom is the concept of providing an absorbent material on the inner wall of the outer tank. SU teaches a tank with absorbent material of positioned on the inner wall of outer tank 1. To modify Hnilcka Jr. with such material would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art because both references are from the same field of endeavor.

The reference to Jackson et al, Loveday, Francis et al, Beckman, Klipping et al and Tench, Jr. are cited of interest.

R. CAPOSSELA:lm
December 15, 1993
703-308-0688


Ronald C. Capossela
Primary Examiner
Unit 344